arXiv:1608.02107v1 [math.CO] 6 Aug 2016

A new bound for Vizing's conjecture

Elliot Krop

Abstract. For any graph G, we define the power $\pi(G)$ as the minimum of the largest number of neighbors in a γ-set of G, of any vertex, taken over all γ-sets of G. We show that $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{\pi(G)}{2\pi(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$. This implies that for any graphs G and H, $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{\gamma(G)}{2\gamma(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$, and if G is claw-free or P_4-free, $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{2}{3}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$, where $\gamma(G)$ is the domination number of G.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 05C69

Keywords: Domination number, Cartesian product of graphs, Vizing's conjecture, power of a graph

1. Introduction

The famous conjecture of Vadim G. Vizing (1963) [**11**] is the simple statement for any two graphs G and H,

$$\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \gamma(G)\gamma(H). \tag{1.1}$$

The survey [**3**] discusses many past results and contemporary approaches to the problem. For more recent partial results see [**9**], [**8**], [**2**], [**5**], and [**7**].

The best current bound for the conjectured inequality was shown in 2010 by Suen and Tarr [**9**],

$$\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{1}{2}\gamma(G)\gamma(H) + \frac{1}{2}\min\{\gamma(G), \gamma(H)\} \tag{1.2}$$

In this paper we define the *power* of a graph $\pi(G)$ and apply the Contractor-Krop overcount technique [**5**] to the method of Brešar [**2**] to show that for any graphs G and H, $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{\pi(G)}{2\pi(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$, which immediately implies the bound $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{\gamma(G)}{2\gamma(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$. By results of [**1**] and [**4**], it follows that if G is claw-free graph or a cograph, for any graph H, $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{2}{3}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$.

Our argument relies on bounding the horizontal domination of vertically undominated cells and is a generalization of the argument in [**7**]. We hope that others will find our approach valuable as our method is quite different from the "double projection" argument of [**9**].

1.1. Notation. All graphs $G(V, E)$ are finite, simple, connected, undirected graphs with vertex set V and edge set E. We may refer to the vertex set and edge set of G as $V(G)$ and $E(G)$, respectively. For more on basic graph theoretic notation and definitions we refer to Diestel [**6**].

For any graph $G = (V, E)$, a subset $S \subseteq V$ *dominates* G if $N[S] = G$. The minimum cardinality of $S \subseteq V$, so that S dominates G is called the *domination number* of G and is denoted $\gamma(G)$. We call a dominating set that realizes the domination number a γ-set.

The *Cartesian product* of two graphs $G_1(V_1, E_1)$ and $G_2(V_2, E_2)$, denoted by $G_1 \Box G_2$, is a graph with vertex set $V_1 \times V_2$ and edge set $E(G_1 \Box G_2) = \{((u_1, v_1), (u_2, v_2)) : v_1 = v_2 \text{ and } (u_1, u_2) \in E_1, \text{ or } u_1 = u_2 \text{ and } (v_1, v_2) \in E_2\}$.

A graph G is *claw-free* if G contains no induced $K_{1,3}$ subgraph, and a *cograph* or P_4*-free* if it contains no induced P_4 subgraph.

If $D = \{v_1, \ldots, v_k\}$ is a minimum dominating set of G, then for any $i \in [k]$, define the set of *private neighbors* for v_i, $P_i = \big\{v \in V(G) - D : N(v) \cap D = \{v_i\}\big\}$. For $S \subseteq [k]$, $|S| \geq 2$, we define the *shared neighbors* of $\{v_i : i \in S\}$, $P_S = \big\{v \in V(G) - D : N(v) \cap D = \{v_i : i \in S\}\big\}$

For $i \in [k]$, let $Q_i = \{v_i\} \cup P_i$. We call $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q_1, \ldots, Q_k\}$ the *cells* of G. For any $I \subseteq [k]$, we write $Q_I = \bigcup_{i \in I} Q_i$ and call $\mathscr{C}(\cup_{i \in I} Q_i) = \bigcup_{i \in I} Q_i \cup \bigcup_{S \subseteq I} P_S$ the *chamber* of Q_I. We may write this as $\mathscr{C}_I$.

For a vertex $h \in V(H)$, the G*-fiber*, G^h, is the subgraph of $G \Box H$ induced by $\{(g, h) : g \in V(G)\}$.

For a minimum dominating set D of $G \Box H$, we define $D^h = D \cap G^h$. Likewise, for any set $S \subseteq [k]$, $P_S^h = P_S \times \{h\}$, and for $i \in [k]$, $Q_i^h = Q_i \times \{h\}$. By v_i^h we mean the vertex (v_i, h). For any $I \in [k]$, we write $\mathscr{C}_{I^h}$ to mean the chamber of $Q_{I^h}^h$.

We may write $\{v_i : i \in I^h\}$ for $\{v_i^h : i \in I^h\}$ when it is clear from context that we are talking about vertices of $G \Box H$ and not vertices of G.

For $i \in [k]$ and $h \in V(H)$, we say that the cell Q_i^h is *vertically dominated* if $(Q_i \times N_H[h]) \cap D \neq \emptyset$. A cell which is not vertically dominated is *vertically undominated*. Any vertex $v \in G \times H$ is *vertically dominated* if $(\{v\} \times N_H[h]) \cap D \neq \emptyset$ and *vertically undominated*, otherwise.

Recently, Chellali et al. [**4**] considered uniformly restricted types of dominating sets. For any graph G and subset of vertices S, they defined S to be a $[j, k]$*-set* if for every vertex $v \in V - S$, $j \leq |N(v) \cap S| \leq k$. For $k \geq 1$, the $[1, k]$*-domination number* of G, written $\gamma_{[1,k]}(G)$, is the minimum cardinality of a $[1, k]$-set in G. A $[1, k]$-set with cardinality $\gamma_{[1,k]}(G)$ is called a $\gamma_{[1,k]}(G)$*-set*.

Among other results, they showed that if G is a claw-free, then $\gamma(G) = \gamma_{[1,2]}(G)$, and that the same result holds if G is P_4-free.

Definition 1.1. *For a fixed γ-set D of G, the* allegiance *of D with respect to G, $a_G(D) = \max_{v \in V(G)}\{|D \cap N[v]\}$.*

Definition 1.2. *The* power *of a graph G, $\pi(G) = \min_D\{a_G(D)\}$ taken over all γ-sets D of G.*

Notice that the power of a graph G is the minimum k so that $\gamma_{[1,k]}(G) = \gamma(G)$.

1.2. A Useful Inequality. Although the following inequality is elementary, we provide the proof for completeness.

PROPOSITION 1.3. *If*

$$f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} i \times t_i$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} t_i = 1 \text{ and } t_1 \geq \sum_{i=2}^{n} (i-1)t_i,$$

for real valued $t_i, 1 \leq i \leq n$, *then*

$$f(t_1, \ldots, t_n) \leq \frac{2n-1}{n}$$

and equality is attained when $t_i = 0$ *for* $1 < i < n$.

PROOF. We induct on n. If $n = 2$, notice that $t_1 = 1 - t_2$, which means that $f(t_1, t_2) = 1 + t_2$. Since $t_2 \leq 1 - t_2$ we see that $t_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}$ which promptly implies $f(t_1, t_2) \leq \frac{3}{2}$.

Suppose the statement true for $n \leq k-1$. We show it true for $n = k$. Let $t_1 + \cdots + t_{k-1} = s$. Then by the induction hypothesis, $\frac{1}{s}\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}(i \times t_i) \leq \frac{2k-3}{k-1}$ and equality is achieved when $t_2 = \cdots = t_{k-2} = 0$. Hence, $\sum_{i=1}^{k-1}(i \times t_i)$ is maximized when $t_2 = \cdots = t_{k-2} = 0$.

We consider the resulting expression, $g(t_1, t_{k-1}, t_k) = t_1 + (k-1)t_{k-1} + kt_k$ subject to $t_1 + t_{k-1} + t_k = 1$ and $t_1 \geq (k-2)t_{k-1} + (k-1)t_k$.

Notice that $t_1 = 1 - t_{k-1} + t_k$ which we can substitute into the constraining inequality to obtain $t_{k-1} \leq \frac{1-kt_k}{k-1}$. Furthermore, since $t_1 + t_k \leq 1$ and $t_1 \geq (k-1)t_k$, we see that $t_k \leq \frac{1}{k}$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} g(t_1, t_{k-1}, t_k) &= 1 - t_{k-1} - t_k + (k-1)t_{k-1} + kt_k \\ &= 1 + (k-2)t_{k-1} + (k-1)t_k \\ &\leq 1 + (k-2)\frac{1-kt_k}{k-1} + (k-1)t_k \\ &= \frac{2k-3}{k-1} + \frac{1}{k-1}t_k \\ &\leq \frac{2k-3}{k-1} + \frac{1}{k-1}\frac{1}{k} \\ &= \frac{2k-1}{k}. \end{aligned}$$

□

2. A New Bound

THEOREM 2.1. *For any graphs* G *and* H,

$$\gamma(G \square H) \geq \frac{\pi(G)}{2\pi(G) - 1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H).$$

PROOF. For any graphs G and H, let $\Gamma = \{v_1, \dots, v_k\}$ be a minimum dominating set of G and D be a minimum dominating set of $G\square H$.

Our proof is composed of increasingly refining labelings of the vertices of D. In all instances, for any $S \subseteq [k]$, if $v \in P_S$, then v may only be labeled by a subset of S. For example, if $v \in P_{i,j}$, then v may be labeled by i, j, or $\{i, j\}$. We call labelings that follow this property *faithful*. For any fixed label i, we project vertices that contain i in their label onto H and produce a dominating set of H. We show a bound on the label overcount to produce the desired inequality.

For any $h \in V(H)$, suppose the fiber G^h contains $\ell_h (= \ell)$ vertically undominated cells $\left\{Q^h_{i_1}, \dots, Q^h_{i_\ell}\right\}$ for $0 \leq \ell \leq k$. We set $I^h = \{i_1, \dots, i_\ell\}$.

We apply the procedure *Labeling 1* to the vertices of D. For $v \in D^h \cap Q^h_i$ for any $h \in V(H)$ and $1 \leq i \leq k$, we label v by $\{j : v \in N[v_j], j \in [k]\}$. If $v \in D^h$ is a shared neighbor of some subset S of $\{v_i : i \in I^h\}$, then it is a member of P^h_S for some $S \subseteq I^h$, and we label v by S. If $v \in D^h$ is a member of P^h_S where $S = R \cup T$ for nonempty $R \subseteq I^h$ and $T \subseteq ([k] - I^h)$, then we label v by R. This completes Labeling 1.

We relabel the vertices of D, doing so in D^h for fixed $h \in H$, stepwise, until we exhaust every $h \in V(H)$. This procedure, which we call *Labeling 2*, is described next.

For every $h \in V(H)$, we list the labels of vertices of D^h, and write them in row h. This produces a two-dimesional array of $|H|$ rows of labels, some of which may be empty. For an arbitrary $h \in V(H)$, we perform two alterations to the labels in row h which we call the *internal* and *external* alterations. In each of these procedures we make the exception which we denote *the dominion rule*: if $v^h_i \in D^h$ with label S, then any alteration of S must retain the label i.

We perform the internal alteration,

(1) For every pair of labels S and T in row h, if $|S \cap T| > 1$, then remove one common element from S and another from T, arbitrarily, subject to the dominion rule. Repeat this step.
(2) If $|S| = 1$, $|T| > 1$, and $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$, then remove the label of S from T, following the dominion rule.
(3) If $|S| = |T| = 1$, then make no changes to S or T.
(4) Otherwise, if $|S| > 1, |T| > 1$, $|S \cap T| = 1$, then remove the common element from one of S or T arbitrarily, subject to the dominion rule.

We repeat this internal alteration for every row $h \in V(H)$ until every pair of labels in a row is a pair of singletons or mutually disjoint.

We perform the external alteration to the array obtained from the internal alteration. Choose any $h \in V(H)$ and suppose $N(h) = \{h_1, \dots, h_n\}$. For every label S in row h, we consider labels T of row h_i for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and repeat the relabeling from the internal alteration,

(1) Set $i = 1$.

(2) For every label S in row h and T in row h_i, if $|S \cap T| > 1$, then remove one common element from S and another from T, arbitrarily, subject to the dominion rule. Repeat this step.
(3) If $|S| = 1$, $|T| > 1$, and $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$, then remove the label of S from T, following the dominion rule.
(4) If $|S| > 1$, $|T| = 1$, and $S \cap T \neq \emptyset$, then remove the label of T from S, following the dominion rule.
(5) If $|S| = |T| = 1$, then make no changes to S or T.
(6) Otherwise, if $|S| > 1, |T| > 1$, and $|S \cap T| = 1$, then remove the common element from one of S or T arbitrarily, subject to the dominion rule.
(7) Let $i = i + 1$ and repeat this relabeling until $i = n + 1$.

After all alterations are performed for every row $h \in V(H)$, we confer the labels in the rows to the corresponding vertices of D. This completes Labeling 2.

Define the index set $I_1^h = [k] - I^h = \{i_{\ell+1}, \ldots, i_k\}$ for vertically dominated cells of G^h. We relabel those vertices of $D^h \cap \mathscr{C}_{I_1^h}$ which are shared neighbors of $\{v_i^h : i \in I_1^h\}$ so that all labels on these vertices are singletons and the labeling remains faithful. We call this procedure *Labeling* 3. For any $h \in V(H)$, if $v \in D^h \cap \mathscr{C}_{I_1^h}$ is a shared neighbor of some vertices of $\{v_i^h : i \in I_1^h\}$, with label S, then choose any element of S and label v by that element. Repeat this procedure for every $h \in V(H)$. This completes Labeling 3.

For $h \in V(H)$, let S_1^h be the vertices of D^h which have labels with more than one element. That is, vertices v labeled by some X so that $|X| > 1$. Say $|S_1^h| = s$ and $S_1^h = \{x_1, \ldots, x_s\}$. Let m_i be the cardinality of the label on $x_i \in S_1^h$. For each vertex in S_1^h, we place each element from the label on that vertex in the set J_1^h. For example, if S_1^h contains vertices with labels $\{i_1, i_2\}$ and $\{i_3, i_4\}$, then $J_1^h = \{i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4\}$.

Claim 2.2. *$\mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$ is dominated by vertices of D^h.*

Proof. Suppose $v \in \mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$ is dominated by $u \in D^{h'}$ for some $h' \in N_H(h)$. Let S be the label on u. Since Labeling 2 has been performed, for any vertex $w \in S_1^h$ with labels T, $S \cap T = \emptyset$ unless $|S| = |T| = 1$. If $|T| = 1$, then $w \notin S_1^h$, contradicting our assumption. Otherwise, elements of S are not in J_1^h leading to $v \notin \mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$ which is a contradiction. □

Set $D_1^h = D^h - (D^h \cap \mathscr{C}_{J_1^h})$. By Claim 2.2 we can let $E_{J_1^h}^h$ be a minimum subset of vertices of D_1^h so that $(D \cap \mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}) \cup E_{J_1^h}^h$ dominates $\mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$. That is, $E_{J_1^h}^h$ is a set of vertices with neighbors in $\mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$, which along with vertices in $D \cap \mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$, dominate $\mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$.

Claim 2.3. *For every $h \in H$, $|E_{J_1^h}^h| \geq \sum_{i=1}^{s}(m_i - 1)$.*

Proof. Set $j = |E_{J_1^h}^h|$ and notice that $E_{J_1^h}^h \cup S_1^h$ dominates $\mathscr{C}_{J_1^h}$. If we let $I' = [k] - J_1^h$, then $E_{J_1^h}^h \cup S_1^h \cup (\bigcup_{i \in I'} v_i^h)$ dominates G^h. We note here that

some elements of $E^h_{J_1^h}$ may also be elements of $\bigcup_{i\in I'} v_i^h$. However, such a set contains at most $j+s+k-\sum_{i=1}^s m_i$ vertices, which must be at least k. Thus, $\sum_{i=1}^s m_i \leq j+s$ and we obtain the desired inequality. □

Notice that for a fixed i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, projecting all vertices with labels containing i to H produces a dominating set of H. Call the set of such vertices of D labeled i, D_i. Summing over all i we count vertices which have one label once and vertices with labels of cardinality m_i, m_i times, for every $h \in V(H)$.

For any $i \in [k]$, let F_i be the set of those vertices of D with labels of cardinality i. We see that

$$\gamma(G)\gamma(H) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} |D_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{k} i \times |F_i| = \sum_{i=1}^{\pi(G)} i \times |F_i| \tag{2.1}$$

Define $t_i = \frac{|F_i|}{|D|}$, for $1 \leq i \leq \pi(G)$. Note that $\sum_{i=1}^{\pi(G)} t_i = 1$. We apply Proposition 1.3 to find that (2.1) $\leq \frac{2\pi(G)-1}{\pi(G)}|D|$, and thus,

$$|D| \geq \frac{\pi(G)}{2\pi(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H).$$

□

2.1. Some Consequences. By definition, $\pi(G) \leq \gamma(G)$ and $\pi(G) \leq \Delta(G)$, which immediately implies the following.

Corollary 2.4. *For any graphs G and H,*

$$\gamma G\Box H \geq \frac{\gamma(G)}{2\gamma(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$$

We note that this bound is an improvement to formula (1.2) when either $\gamma(G) < \frac{\gamma(H)+1}{2}$ or $\gamma(H) < \frac{\gamma(G)+1}{2}$.

Corollary 2.5. *For any graphs G and H,*

$$\gamma G\Box H \geq \frac{\Delta(G)}{2\Delta(G)-1}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$$

Furthermore, since $\gamma(G) = \gamma_{[1,2]}(G)$ holds when G is claw-free or a cograph [**4**], we have the next result.

Corollary 2.6. *If G is claw-free or P_4-free, and H is any graph, $\gamma(G\Box H) \geq \frac{2}{3}\gamma(G)\gamma(H)$.*

References

[1] R.B. Allan and R. Laskar. On domination and independent domination numbers of a graph, Discrete Math., 23: 7376 (1978).

[2] B. Brešar, *Vizing's conjecture for graphs with domination number 3 - a new proof*, Electron. J. Comb. 22(3): P3.38 (2015).

[3] B. Brešar, P. Dorbec, W. Goddard, B. Hartnell, M. Henning, S. Klavžar, D. Rall, *Vizing's conjecture: a survey and recent results*, J. Graph Theory, 69 (1): 46-76 (2012).

[4] M. Chellali, T. Haynes, S. Hedetniemi, A. McRae, *[1,2]-sets in graphs*, Discrete Applied Mathematics, 161: 2885-2893 (2013).
[5] A. Contractor and E. Krop, *A class of graphs approaching Vizing's conjecture*, Theory and Applications of Graphs, 3(1), Article 4 (2016).
[6] R. Diestel, *Graph Theory, Third Edition*, Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg Graduate Texts in Mathematics, Volume 173, New York (2005).
[7] E. Krop, *Vizing's conjectrure: a two-thirds bound for claw-free graphs*, preprint `http://arxiv.org/abs/1607.06936` (2016)
[8] Marcin Pilipczuk, Michał Pilipczuk, and Riste Škrekovski, *Discrete Applied Mathematics*, 160:2484-2490 (2012).
[9] S. Suen, J. Tarr, *An Improved Inequality Related to Vizing's Conjecture*, Electron. J. Combin. 19(1): P8 (2012).
[10] L. Sun, *A result on Vizing's conjecture*, Discrete Math., 275 (1-3): 363-366 (2004).
[11] V. G. Vizing, *The Cartesian Product of Graphs*, Vycisl. Sistemy 9: 30-43 (1963).

Elliot Krop (`elliotkrop@clayton.edu`)

Department of Mathematics, Clayton State University